

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03929 162311Z

71

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-11 L-03 ACDA-19 NSAE-00

PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

ISO-00 DRC-01 /092 W

----- 009244

R 161920Z JUL 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6777

SECDEF

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY ANKARA UNN

AMEMBASSY ATHENS UNN

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY OSLO

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

AMEMBASSY LONDON

S E C R E T USNATO 3929

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: SPC JULY 15 DISCUSSION OF FLANK SECURITY

REF: A) USNATO 2586; B) STATE 151563; C) USNATO 3776

SUMMARY: SPC ON JULY 15 HAD DISCUSSION OF WHAT CHAIRMAN INTRODUCED AS "FLANK SECURITY." NETHERLANDS REP STRONGLY OBJECTED THAT SUBJECT WAS BOTH FLANKS AND WESTERN MILITARY DISTRICTS, FOR WHICH DUTCH HAD ADVANCED PROPOSAL ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION AS SOLUTION. U.S. REP PROPOSED AMENDING BELGIAN COMPROMISE FORMULATION BY DELETION OF "IDRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY," WITH INDIRECT REDEPLOYMENT COVERED IN NON-CIRCUMVENTION CAUSE. FRG WANTED PRECISE DEFINITION OF GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS CONCERNED, AND OF "DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY." TURKISH REP SAID TURKEY HAD REFRAINED FROM OFFERING AMENDMENTS TO BELGIAN FORMULATION, AND THOUGHT SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03929 162311Z

U.S. AMENDMENT REDUCED CHANCE FOR COMPROMISE. NETHERLANDS REP FOUND U.S. POSITION UNSATISFACTORY IN ABSENCE OF U.S. IDEAS ON SEPARATE NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE. END SUMMARY

1. KASTL (SPC CHAIRMAN) BEGAN DISCUSSION WITH BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF INTRODUCTORY SECTION OF FUTURE IS DOCUMENT BRINGING TOGETHER VARIOUS FORMULATIONS ON FLANK SECURITY. NETHERLANDS REP STRONGLY CRITICIZED KASTL FOR "RENAMING THE SUBJECT FLANK SECURITY", WHEN THE SUBJECT WAS REALLY MUCH BROADER. HE REMINDED KASTL THAT NETHERLANDS CONSIDERS WESTERN MILITARY DISTRICTS OF SOVIET UNION JUST AS IMPORTANT AS FLANK REGIONS. HE NOTED THAT PARA 30 OF C-M(73)83 CONCERNED BOTH FLANKS AND WESTERN MILITARY DISTRICTS. THE DUTCH PROPOSAL ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION (REF A) SOUGHT TO MEET BOTH ISSUES. KASTL REPLIED THAT THE IS INTRODUCTORY SECTION WOULD BE CONSTRUCTED SO AS NOT TO PREJUDICE ACCEPTANCE OF ANY OF THE FORMULATIONS.

2. U.S. REP THEN STATED POSITION AUTHORIZED IN PARA 3A (REF B). U.S. REP SAID WE COULD ACCEPT BELGIAN COMPROMISE FORMULATION (REF C WITH ONE CHANGE: DELETION OF WORDS "DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY", WITH QUESTION OF INDIRECT REDEPLOYMENT TREATED IN A NON-CIRCUMVENTION CALUSE. U.S. REP SAID WE CONSIDER SUCH A PROVISION ADEQUATE TO INSURE THAT FORCE REDPLOYMENTS ARISING OUT OF PHASE I WITHDRAWALS WOULD NOT DIMINISH SECURITY OF ANY ALLY. HE STATED THAT MORE DETAILED LANGUAGE WOULD RISK ENLARGING THE AREA COVERED BY THE NEGOTIATIONS BEYOND THE NGA, WOULD PROBABLY BE NON-NEGOTIABLE, AND COULD ENDANGER PROSPECTS OF ACHIEVING AGREED ALLIED OBJECTIVES IN MBFR, INCLUDING PROTECTION OF FLANK INTERESTS. U.S. REP ALSO NOTED THE VALIDITY OF NORWEGIAN COMMENT AT JULY 5 SPC CONCERNING APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLE OF NON-DIMINISHED SECURITY TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE ALLIANCE, AND SAID U.S. COULD SUPPORT LANGUAGE REVISING THE BELGIAN FORMULATION IN THIS RESPECT.

3. NORWEGIAN REP SAID HE MADE HIS COMMENT AT JULY 5 SPC ON UNDERSTANDING THAT "DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY" WOULD BE RETAINED IN BELGIAN PROPOSAL. HE THOUGHT THAT WITHOUT "DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY", AND WITHOUT SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO NOT DIMINISHING SECURITY OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS, THE BELGIAN PROPOSAL MIGHT NOT DO MUCH FOR THE FLANK COUNTRIES. THEREFORE HE WOULD NOT INSIST ON HIS SUGGESTION OF JULY 5.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03929 162311Z

4. FRG REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES FOUND THAT THE BELGIAN FORMULATION NEEDED MORE PRECISION. HE THEN REITERATED FRG POSITION THAT THE GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS CONCERNED SHOULD BE VERY CAREFULLY DEFINED EITHER IN AN INTERPRETATIVE DECLARATION OR AN EXCHANGE OF LETTERS. HE ADDED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WANTED THE MEANING OF "DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY" PRECISELY DEFINED. FRG REP ALSO WANTED EXCEPTIONS, AS IN GREEK PROPOSAL, FOR NORMAL EXERCISES AND ROTATIONS.

5. TURKISH REP SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WERE NOT COMPLETELY SATISFIED WITH BELGIAN FORMULATION BUT HAD REFRAINED FROM OFFERING AMENDMENTS IN THE INTEREST OF COMPROMISE. THE FACT THAT THE U.S. NOW WANTS AMENDMENTS REDUCES THE CHANCE FOR

COMPROMISE. TH BELGIAN TEXT DOES LACK CERTAIN THINGS, SUCH AS PRECISE DEFINITION OF GEOGRAPHIC AREAS, TURKEY SUPPORTS "DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY." TURKISH REP ALSO NOTED THAT SPC HAS AWAITED FOR SOME TIME U.S. IDEAS ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE AND ASKED WHEN SPC MIGHT EXPECT IT. U.S. REP STAED THAT U.S. HAD ISSUE UNDER STUDY, BUT NON-CIRCUMVENTION WAS BORADER ISSUE THAN FLANK SECURITY AND THAT WE COULD NOT SAY WHEN WE WOULD HAVE U.S. VIEWS.

6. NETHERLANDS REP SAID HE DID NOT FIND U.S. POSITION SATISFACTORY. U.S. IN DELETING "DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY", IS DELETING THE DIFFICULT ISSUE. THE U.S. WANTS TO DEAL WITH THE ISSUE IN A NON-CIRCUMVENTION CALUSE, BUT THE ALLIES HAVE WAITED MONTHS TO HEAR U.S. VIEWS ON THE POSSIBLE CONTENT OF SUCH A CALUSE.

7. COMMENT: MISSION CONSIDERS THAT GUIDANCE IN REF B PROVIDES USEFUL BASIS FOR U.S. PARTICIPATION IN SPC DISCUSSION OF FLANK SECURITY IN COMING WEEKS. IT WOULD BE HELPFUL, IN THIS RESPECT, FOR WASHINGTON TO GIVE US SOME INDICATION OF ITS THINKING ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION CALUSE FOR PRESENTATION TO SPC.

8. SPC WILL RETURN TO FLANK SECURITY ON JULY 23. RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 16 JUL 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO03929
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740788/abbrywel.tel
Line Count: 132
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 2586; B) STATE 151563; C) USNATO 3776
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 20 JUL 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <20-Jul-2001 by kellerpr>; APPROVED <13 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: SPC JULY 15 DISCUSSION OF FLANK SECURITY
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
ANKARA UNN
ATHENS UNN
BONN
COPENHAGEN
OSLO

USCINCEUR
USNMR SHAPE
LONDON

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005